THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE, THURSDAY, JUNE 8, 1871.

The Chicago Tribune.

VOL. 24. CHICAGO, THURSDAY, JUNE 8, 1871. NO. 32

FOREIGN.

Horrible Scenes at the Capture of Paris.

The Southwest Portion of the City One Sheet of Flame.

Indiscriminate Massacre of Prisoners in the Streets.

A Pen-Picture of the Amazons of the Seine.

List of the Public Buildings Wholly or Partially Destroyed.

The Military and Political Situation Yesterday.

FRANCE.

Special Dispatch to The Chicago Tribune.

THE CAPTURE OF PARIS.

NEW YORK, June 7.—[Extra.]—The capture of Paris and the subsequent scenes of carnage and conflagration are described by the steamer Ville du Havre, which arrived at this port to-day. She left Havre on the 2nd inst., and brings the following dispatches:

The military forces of the Commune, consisting of the National Guard, the Reds, and the Paris Rabble, numbered about 200,000 men. Of these, 60,000 were in the vicinity of the Arc de Triomphe, on the Champs Elysees, and in the Bois de Boulogne, and 40,000 were in the vicinity of the Bastile. The remainder were scattered in the various parts of the city. The Versailles army, under the command of Marshal MacMahon, consisted of 120,000 men, and was divided into three corps, under the command of Generals Ladmirault, Clinchant, and Douay. The first corps, under Ladmirault, was stationed on the right bank of the Seine, and was to attack the Bastile and the Arc de Triomphe. The second corps, under Clinchant, was stationed on the left bank of the Seine, and was to attack the Champ de Mars and the Trocadero. The third corps, under Douay, was stationed on the left bank of the Seine, and was to attack the Point du Jour and the Porte Maillot. The reserves, under the command of General Vinoy, were stationed at Versailles, Meudon, and Sevres.

The attack was commenced on Sunday morning, May 21, by the capture of the Point du Jour by the troops under Douay. The Communists, after a slight resistance, fled in confusion, and the Versailles troops entered the city without further opposition. The troops under Clinchant and Ladmirault also entered the city at the points of attack assigned them, and met with but little resistance. The Communists, however, fought desperately behind the barricades, and contested every inch of ground. The Versailles troops, however, pushed steadily forward, and by Wednesday night had captured the Champs Elysees, the Arc de Triomphe, the Place de la Concorde, the Tuileries, the Louvre, the Palais Royal, the Hotel de Ville, the Bastile, and the Place Vendome. The Communists, during the last days of the struggle, fought with the desperation of madmen. They refused to surrender, and when driven from their barricades, fled to the houses, from the windows of which they kept up a galling fire upon the troops. Many of the houses were filled with petroleum, and when the Communists were driven from them they were fired by the retreating Communists. Many of the principal buildings in the city were destroyed by fire. The Tuileries, the Palais Royal, the Hotel de Ville, the Palace of Justice, the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Marine, the Ministry of the Interior, the Ministry of Public Instruction, the Ministry of Commerce, the Ministry of Public Works, the Ministry of War, the Palace of the Legion of Honor, the Palace of the Council of State, the Palace of the Court of Accounts, the Palace of the Tuileries, the Palace of the Louvre, the Palace of the Institute, the Palace of the Bourbon, the Palace of the Luxembourg, the Palace of the Senate, the Palace of the Archbishop, the Palace of the Prefecture of Police, the Palace of the Prefecture of the Seine, the Palace of the Municipal Council, the Palace of the Tribunal of Commerce, the Palace of the Mint, the Palace of the Customs, the Palace of the Exchange, the Palace of the Post-Office, the Palace of the Telegraph, the Palace of the Opera, the Palace of the Theatre Francais, the Palace of the Theatre Lyrique, the Palace of the Theatre Porte St. Martin, the Palace of the Theatre du Chatelet, the Palace of the Theatre Historique, the Palace of the Theatre Cluny, the Palace of the Theatre Beaumarchais, the Palace of the Theatre Ambigu Comique, the Palace of the Theatre Gaite, the Palace of the Theatre Folies Dramatiques, the Palace of the Theatre Vaudeville, the Palace of the Theatre Varietes, the Palace of the Theatre Palais Royal, the Palace of the Theatre Bouffes Parisiens, the Palace of the Theatre Folies Nouvelles, the Palace of the Theatre Menus Plaisirs, the Palace of the Theatre Athenee, the Palace of the Theatre Cirque, the Palace of the Theatre Hippodrome, the Palace of the Theatre Alcazar, the Palace of the Theatre Delassements Comiques, the Palace of the Theatre Folies Marigny, the Palace of the Theatre Bouffes du Nord, the Palace of the Theatre Folies Bergeres, the Palace of the Theatre Folies Belleville, the Palace of the Theatre Folies Montmartre, the Palace of the Theatre Folies Batignolles, the Palace of the Theatre Folies Pigalle, the Palace of the Theatre Folies Clichy, the Palace of the Theatre Folies Rochechouart, the Palace of the Theatre Folies Montparnasse, the Palace of the Theatre Folies Saint-Germain, the Palace of the Theatre Folies Saint-Sulpice, the Palace of the Theatre Folies Saint-Denis, the Palace of the Theatre Folies Saint-Martin, the Palace of the Theatre Folies Saint-Antoine, the Palace of the Theatre Folies Saint-Jacques, the Palace of the Theatre Folies Saint-Michel

The Chicago Tribune.

TRIBUNE COMPANY,

OFFICE, TRIBUNE BUILDING,

N. E. CORNER CLARK AND MADISON STS.

THURSDAY, JUNE 8, 1871.

THE EMINENT DOMAIN BILL.

In the session of the present Legislature Dr. a bill proposing to confer upon all the people of this section of the State the right to take private property for their own use. They propose to pay for the property taken without violence, and the real benefit which will accrue to the rising property of the same owner, believe, this law never has been done under government, and the fact that it is only known in the policies somewhere and heretofore in England and the United States. Some pretended evidence that it must conflict with justice, but this is of the very essence of the right. It is the right to take private property for private use, and the only question is, Shall the public have the right, or shall it not? Shall the public should pay for what it gets, or not? Is justice to be done, or is it not? Shall it be done to the rich as well as to the poor?

But the rule that the public shall pay for the land used for street service is not a universal rule in the United States. It has never been such in the States. It has never been such in the States. It has never been such in the

STRASBOURG.

Horror of the Bombardment.

Present Condition of the City.

The Cathedral.

Her Contest With the Change of Allegiance.

(Correspondence of the London Times.)

STRASBOURG, May 19.

Approaching Strasbourg the first thing that strikes the attention, after the great height of the towers, is the marks of the bullets and shells with which the Germans architects have adorned, or rather disfigured, it. Still in many places bare, and in others but sett down and tile and slate, it is evident that the gaps are but a quarter of an hour's work. Here and there, too, a few more earthworks thrown up, and the friend there thinks but poorly of the foe. But, on the whole, where has there been more life, more energy, more hope? Even the old men are young. The houses in the streets are either demolished or shot to bits from either bombardment or their neighbors. Everything is busy. Long before you can see it, you can hear the sound of the hammer and the saw, and the rebel walls standing in the midst of the rebel walls which have arisen on the old site. On the walls and within are many others one can perceive that the work is fairly begun. The buildings of the city have all been numbered and registered, and the work of reconstruction is now being actively carried on. Time is the only thing wanted. The money is there in the shape of indemnities, and the men are there in the shape of workmen. Within the walls of many ruined houses one would not think that there has been any bombardment. Everything is "all right" and "as it was" save in that long row of houses which fronts the Broglie, and which, from the Rue des Juifs to the Rue de la Nuée Bleue, is a mass of ruins. Here and there on the upper stories one can see that some rooms are still habitable, and in the lower stories there is still a busy hammering and sawing of every one. There is a busy hammering and sawing of every one. There is a busy hammering and sawing of every one. There is

THE LAW COURTS.

The Joint Duty of Railway Companies and Their Passengers.

A Large Number of Licenses Closed—The "Rocket" Road.

United States Circuit Court.

RAILROAD LAW.

The case of Mary J. Sumner against the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railway Company was continued yesterday on your correspondent's return to Court. Judge Drummond, Judge Davis was absent, and Judge Dyer presided.

Mr. Spencer brought suit to recover for personal injuries, from which, he states, great pain was alleged, by reason of the negligence on the part of the company. It would seem that the plaintiff's wife, Mary J., was a passenger on the train which was wrecked, and received the injuries complained of. The defendants, in answering, state that the wife was a passenger on the train, but that she had no ticket, and refused to pay her fare, and that the conductor, in order to enforce the payment of the fare, requested her to leave the train, which she refused to do, and that in the struggle which ensued between the conductor and the plaintiff's wife, she received the injuries complained of. The defendants also state that the plaintiff's wife was a trespasser, and that the company is not liable for injuries received by her. The plaintiff replies to the answer, and denies that the wife was a trespasser, and that she refused to pay her fare, and that the conductor requested her to leave the train, and that she refused to do so. The plaintiff also states that the wife was a passenger, and that the company is liable for injuries received by her. Mr. Sumner was called to the stand, and testified that his wife was a passenger on the train, and that she was injured in the manner stated in the declaration. Mr. Sumner was then asked to state what his wife's condition was after the accident, but the question was objected to by the defendants, and the objection was sustained by the Court. Mr. Sumner was then asked to state what his wife's condition was before the accident, but the question was objected to by the defendants, and the objection was sustained by the Court